

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 553

FL 010 362

AUTHOR Riley, Roberta D.
TITLE Should We Teach Urban Black Students Standard English? Lektos: Interdisciplinary Working Papers in Language Sciences, Vol. 3, No. 1.
INSTITUTION Louisville Univ., Ky. Interdisciplinary Program in Linguistics.
PUB DATE Nov 78
NOTE 33p.
AVAILABLE FROM University of Louisville, Interdisciplinary Program in Linguistics, Room 214 Humanities, Louisville, Kentucky 40208
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Failure; *American English; *Black Dialects; *Black Students; Caucasian Students; Disadvantaged Groups; Failure Factors; *Language Development; Language Research; *Linguistic Theory; Low Achievement Factors; Nonstandard Dialects; Reading Instruction; *Standard Spoken Usage; Textbook Selection; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS *Black English

ABSTRACT

The research and theoretical rationale for differences between (urban) black and white students, particularly in achievement in language development, are discussed along with implications for the classroom. Theories about language acquisition and capacity that have developed to account for the poor school performance of urban black students include the deficit theory, elaborated and restricted language code theory, the genetic inferiority theory, and the difference theory. Linguistic assumptions about the nature of language, the assumption that deprived children are nonverbal, assumptions about the environment of the disadvantaged child, and problems with testing and textbooks are discussed. The following questions are addressed: (1) whether to teach standard English before or after initial reading instruction, (2) whether initial reading instruction for nonstandard speakers is dialect reading of traditional materials, and (3) whether reading materials should be revised so that grammatical forms unfamiliar to the nonstandard speaker are eliminated. The most radical proposal involves the use of black dialect readers. Proponents of dialect readers assert that there is enough difference between standard and nonstandard dialects to require the nonstandard dialect readers. Opposing viewpoints are presented. Drills that have been proposed to differentiate standard and nonstandard forms are presented. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

John A. Robinson

SHOULD WE TEACH URBAN BLACK STUDENTS STANDARD ENGLISH?

Roberta D. Riley

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Answering the question, "Should nonstandard speakers learn standard English?", involves consideration of several points. How much language is an indicator of social class and how much people base their feelings about other people on their speech are social considerations. Related to these items is employability of the nonstandard speaker.

In many countries, speech patterns and facility in reading and writing skills differentiate among the classes. In India, for example, only the Brahman caste can read and write. Shaw's play Pygmalion illustrates how people's language can influence the way they are treated. In America, we like to think that not only is diversity accepted, but also that our differences are minimal, the "melting pot" theory.

In fact, American English speech varieties are distinct and can be associated with social status by listeners. Putnam and O'Hern used one minute taped samples of twelve black people, of varying educational and social backgrounds, recounting a fable, "The Lion and the Mouse" in their own words. Fifty-five white students' mean ratings of the speaker's social status correlated .80 with the Warner Index, a measure of social status. Despite the fact that the black speakers had various regional dialects, the raters were able to identify the speaker's social status. Harms, using the same tapes as Putnam and O'Hern found that Midwest listeners were as accurate as Easterners in this identification (Ellis, 1967: 432-434).

Ellis found that people were generally unable to conceal their social status even in a role-playing situation. The correlation dropped, but respondents still managed to associate speaker and social class fairly accurately (Ellis, 1967: 434). Research does seem to indicate that listeners associate social class with a person's speech. What effects this labeling has on the speaker is another question. A well-known study investigating this idea is that of Lambert's (1960). He used tapes of bi-lingual speakers whom French and English Canadian college students rated. The English speakers were given more favorable ratings than the French speakers, even though they were the same people (Hopper, 1972: 2-3). Stereotyping behavior seemed to occur in a study where teachers evaluated children's speech on a semantic differential scale; the teachers tended to rate the black children similarly, despite their varying speech mechanisms (Williams, 1971: 110).

Ellis reported that high status speakers are rated as more credible and likeable than low status speakers. He points out that listeners, when assessing the position a speaker is qualified for, associates level of employment with the social status of the speaker (Ellis, 1967: 436). One's speech appears to be related to level of employment. Shuy (1970) conducted a study in which sixteen employers listened to tapes of sixteen

ED172553

FL010362

male speakers. Lower socio-economic status speakers were most frequently rated as not employable (Hopper, 1972:3). Johnson states that standard English is necessary for prestige jobs, e.g., manager, executive, professional. However, middle level jobs, skilled labor and crafts, do not require standard English; blacks have generally been barred from these positions always because of unions. Lower status jobs do not require standard speech (Johnson, 1971:90). A fine study conducted by Hopper bears out much of what Johnson believes. Hopper conducted several studies looking into the relationship of speech and employability. Twelve professional interviewers listened to nine-second answers to typical interview questions, which were the basis for forming a semantic differential scale. Twenty-three professional interviewers, using the scale, responded to four nine-second speech samples (Black, Mexican-American, White Southerners and Standard English speakers). Factor analysis revealed the following:

- I. Intelligence and competence (26.48% of variance)
- II. Agreeableness of speaker (16.3% of variance)
- III. Self-assurance of speaker (16.5% of variance)
- IV. Anglo-like/Non-Anglo-like (7.5% of variance)

Surprisingly, ethnicity seemed to be of least importance (Hopper, (1972: 6). The scale used can be found in Appendix B.

In Hopper's second study, forty employers listened to tapes of four speakers (2 blacks; 1 white Southerner; 1 standard English speaker) and rated them on competency, agreeability, assurance. Standard English speakers proved to be most likely to be employed for executive, foreman and supervisory positions. Hopper concluded that this fact holds true because these positions are speech related (Hopper, 1972:9). For future research, he recommended the following: a greater number and variety of speakers could be employed; study of employers and ways they make a decision; study the influence of more information, e.g., resumes, video-tapes (Hopper, 1972:14).

Victor Cline's research challenged previous findings that speech is associated with social class. He presented interviewees in a variety of situations: silent film; sound film; sound; manuscript; brief, content-free speech samples. He found that the content of the speech was more important than appearance, voice quality, or body language in people's evaluation of the speech of others. Basing his study on Cline's recent research, Richard Lee investigated the relationship of speech and employment. With his second grade group, who matched eight 15-17 year olds with the highest job they could hold, he found that the second graders concurred on which position required good speech, but when asked twice to rank each voice with the highest job it could hold, the ratings went up or down (Lee, 1972:2-4).

Junior and senior high students improved over second graders in inter-rater reliability but still reached no consensus. College sophomores listened to the eight speakers in random order under varying

situations (edited, unedited, and reading a short narrative) and again one week later. Only 50% of the time were the listeners able to give the same ratings to the same voice. Inter- and intra-rater reliability were not established. There was little agreement among raters, and individuals changed their assessments from one week to the next (Lee, 1972:5-7). Content, voice quality, and pauses, mood, personality, age, sex, and appearance all influence the listener and account for the lack of reliability. In agreement with Williams, Lee finds that listeners seem to react to "general speech and communication rather than specific linguistic clues" (Lee, 1972:8). However, most of the research indicates that a speaker's social class can be identified by listeners and that this labeling does have social and economic implications. Nonetheless, Lee's emphasis on communication seems worthwhile pursuing. His idea can be made practical in several ways. For instance, students can create evaluation criteria for the speech of others and share their criteria. Setting up role playing situations and having students discuss alternative ways of stating their ideas could be useful. More of these ideas will be explored in the section on strategies.

The following sections explore the research and theoretical rationale for differences between black (urban) and white students, particularly in achievement in language development. Implications for the language arts classroom on all levels will be discussed. Abrahams claims that the term disadvantaged initially referred to those groups denied economic and political power, but now its application has been extended to refer to mental abilities (1970:27). However, the fact is that urban black students do poorly in school. Academic performance does correlate strongly with socio-economic status and segregated ethnic groups do less well than those who are integrated (Labov, 1972:181-182). This continued poor showing of the urban black child has been a growing concern of educators, psychologists, linguists, and community people; a major focus of their concern has centered on the language the child brings to school and its effect on his or her learning. To account for this poor school performance, several theories around language acquisition and capacity have developed.

The Deficit Theory: Until the 1960's, the language of the low income child was viewed as limited and debilitating, affecting every aspect of school work. There is nothing unusual in this view; deviations from the norm are often regarded with condescension. Black children were described as inarticulate and underdeveloped. Research has developed in several directions: studies on the environment of the child; on the language and cognitive abilities; and more recently, on genetic factors and intelligence.

Language and Cognitive Abilities and Environment: Research data supporting this segment of the deficit hypothesis is extensive although open to question. Basil Bernstein, who has studied language and social class with British families, has served as a source for much of this research. He speaks of two codes or two types of language which are delineated in the chart below (Bernstein, 1972:164).

BERNSTEIN'S CODES

Elaborated	Restricted
1. Universalistic	1. Particularistic
2. Articulated symbols	2. Condensed symbols
3. Meaning freed from context	3. Meaning embedded in context
4. Explicit meaning	4. Implicit meaning
5. Rationality	5. Metaphor
6. Understood by all	6. Understood by insiders

The lower class utilizes the restricted code characterized in language terms by: short, simple, unfinished sentences with poor syntax, usually active voice; simple repetitive use of conjunctions; few subordinate clauses; inability to maintain formal subject through a speech sequence; rigid, limited use of adverbs and adjectives; numerous personal pronouns; confusion of reason and conclusion in remarks producing categoric statements; frequent use of phrases signaling reinforcement, e.g., "isn't it", "you know" (Donofrio, 1972; Deutsch, 1967:86).

Lawton's study supports Bernstein's elaborated/restricted code. He found significant differences in language performance between working class and middle class groups, ages 12-15, on the following variables: total number of subordinate clauses, use of subordination, and complexity of verbal stem and passive verbs. Trends favoring the middle class group were found in adjectival clauses, clause complexity, uncommon adverbs and personal pronouns. Lawton concludes that "social class differences in language are already in existence at twelve and become increasingly important in the following three years" (Lawton, 1974:202-204). A problem in most linguistic research is sample size; in this case the total n=20 for each group.

Bernstein's initial descriptions of these codes is vague and sophisticated, and he offers few concrete examples. Perhaps, this accounts for some of the misinterpretation and misuse of his theory. Only after reading the studies he cites, did I begin to realize that Bernstein saw the language and social class problem as a complex issue. He is not easily categorized under the deficit theory; he is placed here because the American theorists, Deutsch, Bereiter, and Englemann, have used him as a springboard for their research and program development.

Bernstein discusses the work of Geoffrey Turner who found that working class five-year olds used less expressions of uncertainty than middle class children. He carefully points out that this result does not indicate that working class children do not have access to such expression but that the situation, telling stories about pictures, may not have elicited them. The working class children produced freer, lengthier, and more original stories about doll figures; whereas, the middle class stories revealed tight construction. In a role-playing situation, more middle-class children refused to respond to a question

phrased, "What is the man in the picture saying?" but would respond to "What do you think the man is saying?". Possibly, the middle class children are more concerned with accuracy or require definite instructions for doing a task (Bernstein, 1972:168-169). Bernstein states that the

different focusing of experience through a restricted code creates a major problem of educability only where the school produces discontinuity between its symbolic orders and those of the child. Our schools are not made for these children; why should the children respond? To ask the child to switch to an elaborated code which presupposes different role relationships and systems of meaning without a sensitive understanding of the required contents must create for the child a bewildering and potentially damaging experience.

(Bernstein, 1972:173)

When Bernstein speaks of codes, then, he is discussing them in a descriptive sense rather than an evaluative one. He refers to language use. Although the word restricted is suggestive of limited, he does not claim that users of the restricted code have cognitive defects. Finally, he lays the problem of communication between teacher and student in the school's lap.

Bert Brown of the Institute for Developmental Studies found that lower-class children were less well developed in labeling ability than middle class children. In classifying tasks, e.g., grouping cards, the lower class children were less able to form groupings and to verbalize about them. Brown found that while the verbal production for the lower class was the same as for the middle class, the verbal power was less. Lower class speech was characterized by pauses, repetitions and extra words (Brown, n.d.:5-8). Deutsch's specific findings related to language suggest:

1. Disadvantaged children seem to be weak in their use of verbs, but better in their use of descriptive adjectives.
2. Their receptive linguistic ability is better than their performance.
3. Their abilities to fantasize are strong.
4. Less structured, spontaneous situations facilitate their language performance.

(Riessman, 1962:77)

Reissman mentions Irving Taylor's research in connection with Deutsch's. Taylor employed an original word-distance scale, similar to a Thurstone

type, and found that disadvantaged children responded with a wider range of association to stimulus words, and not because they did not know the meaning of the stimulus words. He concluded that the responses of these children were "less conventional, more unusual, original, flexible, independent and visual than they are thought to be" (Riessman, 1962:78). These remarks are more enthusiastic than Deutsch's, but the phrase "than they are thought to be" provokes questions.

In tests for auditory discrimination, a skill needed for acquisition of reading and other verbal abilities, lower-class children have done poorly. A noisy environment is believed to be the cause (Deutsch, 1963:170-181). However, the language of the subject may preclude good results in an auditory discrimination test (Politzer, 1971:176). If the phonetic contrasts used in the tests are not present in the subject's language, then he or she will not be capable of differentiating the sounds correctly (Fasold, 1971:85). For example, the Wepman test asks the subject to differentiate between "wreath-reef; lave-lathe"; in urban black dialect, these words often sound the same; therefore, dialect interference could account for the subject's failure to discriminate (Wolfram, 1970:4). While the test may be culturally bound to standard English, these children will not perform well.

Deutsch finds that, in addition to weak auditory discrimination, the disadvantaged child had poor habits in seeing, hearing, and thinking. He or she had difficulty in visual discrimination tasks and with basic concepts, e.g., time and number. Thus, in school, this child does not listen to the teacher well and cannot see things. This deficit grows with each school year and results in a "cumulative deficit for the disadvantaged child (Deutsch, 1963:170-181).

Deutsch claims that these results may be caused by environment. He contrasts the lower-class home with that of the middle class.

1. Organized family activities are few, so less opportunities for conversation among lower-class family members are provided. Although Wolfram challenges this idea because it takes into account only one model of language acquisition, parent-child (Wolfram, 1970:3), the importance of the parent to the child's learning of language should not be underestimated.
2. Responses to children's questions are generally monosyllabic in the lower-class home.
3. Instead of explanations and complete sentences, exclamations, imperatives and partial sentences make up the conversational interaction. The "inadequate mother" hypothesis relates to these points. Hess and Shipman (1970), investigating maternal influences on early learning, found middle class mothers were more likely to use an

elaborate code; whereas black lower-class mothers tended to use imperatives. The inadequate lower-class mother is further documented by Gordon (1968), who claimed that she does not talk with her children; Henry (1965), who stated that meals are not at regular times; Katz (1968), who observed that she does not get involved in school activities (Donofrio, 1972:18).

4. John (1963) points out the middle class child has the advantage of tutoring help at home (Deutch, 1965:79-80).
5. Few toys and books limit amount of stimulation in the lower-class child's environment.
6. Unstable family life and poor housing affect child's development.

Points 5 and 6 are said to contribute to faulty perceptual discrimination (Wolfram, 1970:4). Because of this environment, disadvantaged children are not future oriented, cannot focus on long-range goals, feel powerless, do not know how to use adults as sources of information, have retarded language development, etc. It follows that they would do badly in school. However, Deutch (1967) believes that some of the responsibility is the school's too.

One of the problems with many of these studies is the researcher's perspective. They have investigated the lower class from a middle class viewpoint. Rather than seeing what factors might contribute to language and cognitive development in the lower class environment, they assess that environment in light of its deviations from the middle class. The work of Bereiter and Englemann has been a source of much controversy. In their studies of four-year old children in Urbana, Illinois, they found the lower class black children were unable to ask questions, make statements or give explanations, had restricted vocabularies, couldn't make if-then deductions, and answered in monosyllables and gestures. They concluded that the environment held these children back and that their language was not merely a deviation from standard English, but reflected cognitive deficiencies (Bereiter et alia, 1966). Labov points out that until the testing situation was set in ways conducive to eliciting verbal behavior from disadvantaged children, he obtained the same results. He fears that data gathered by Bereiter and Englemann will be regarded as having accurately measured the verbal capacity of the urban child (Labov, 1972:214). Fasold asserts that the if-then deductions asked for in the testing situations require these children to use a language construction that is not part of their dialect (Fasold, 1971:84-85).

Based on their research, Bereiter and Englemann have created a program designed to teach disadvantaged pre-school children standard

English, knowledge of which is a necessity for logical thought. These children are asked to respond in complete sentences to a series of questions. For example, to a question about a picture, "Where is the squirrel?", the response must be "The squirrel is in the tree." Instructional time could be better spent (Labov, 1972:184). Labov shows that ghetto children can produce abstract concepts using a restricted code; his conclusion is that Bereiter and Englemann "confuse logic with explicitness." It must be said that Labov, although persuasive, often uses single case studies to support his points. Fasold states that linguists believe that logical thought can be expressed in any grammatical system (Fasold, 1971:83). Finally, in order to determine if linguistic forms and usage relate to cognitive ability, one would have to substantiate code equivalence (Baratz, 1970:23).

Labov is concerned that children will be more alienated from school because of lockstep programs, such as Bereiter and Englemann's (Labov, 1972:208). Englemann retorts that the response to their program has been positive although he fails to cite specific instruments or data. Further, he claims linguists have offered nothing for educators to further learning. Although linguists have been slow in developing concrete programs to go along with their ideas, Englemann's attack appears to be one of defensiveness (Englemann, 1971:141-151).

The Genetic Inferiority Theory: The failure of early intervention programs, such as Operation Headstart, could be due to faulty implementation or to the fact that these children were beyond help. Jensen hypothesizes that intervention programs fail because of the heritability of I.Q. The fifteen point difference between black and white children he attributes to differences in genetic (80%) and environmental (20%) factors. He recommends that black children spend less time on abstract learning and more on rote learning (Jensen, 1969).

Problems with Jensen's work abound. The samples he cites as evidence are small, and many of the studies were done abroad. It may be possible that low I.Q. people do have similar genes, but to generalize and differentiate between the races on this basis is hasty. Silberman suggests that Jensen, by stressing socio-economic status, overlooks the importance of the American environment on the black -- its destruction of his ambition, self-concept, and heritage (Silberman, 1970:75-79). Jensen misuses some of his information. He employs Herber's study to develop a chart on the "Estimated Prevalence of Children with I.Q.'s below 75." Labov points out that this use of Herber's data is biased since the percentages comes from a group in Milwaukee which has many retardates (Labov, 1972:212). There is an emotional reaction to some of Jensen's remarks, no matter how carefully they are stated. How will it help my teaching if I know that black people are genetically inferior to whites?

The Difference Theory: Using the difference theory, we can escape blaming a group and begin to understand their language. For teachers, this attitude is important; rather than believing a dialect to be inferior ("logically faulty" or "verbally deprived"), the dialect assumes legitimacy in the classroom, and perhaps the child does, too. The sociolin-

linguists respond to the deficit theorists in the following areas: discussions of language; verbal abilities of urban blacks; family life; testing; and "the neglected situation." In general, they raise questions about the kind of research conducted, its methodology, and provide different perspectives on the problems.

Views on Language: Bernstein states that speech creates varying orders of relevance and relationship for speakers and defines language as "the set of rules to which speech codes comply." There is no justification for thinking that one language code is superior to another (Bernstein, 1972:161). Each language variety has its own rules for pronunciation and grammar. These rules may differ from the standard dialect, but that does not mean that they are illogical or inconsistent (Wolfram, 1970:2). The intent of grammar rules is to indicate the way sentences are used in a particular speech community; grammar is a description of the language used by that speech community and not a prescription for correct speech behavior (Fasold, 1971:83). Linguistic assumptions about the nature of language are incompatible with the deficit theory:

1. Every language is capable of conceptualization. The surface form of a sentence has nothing to do with its logic.
2. Every language or dialect is adequate for communication. Acceptance by society is not a criteria for assessing communication adequacy of a language.
3. All languages are systematic and ordered.
4. By age six, the child has learned the language of his community; i.e., lower-class children learn non-standard dialect as quickly as middle-class children (Wolfram, 1970:2).

Baratz argues that deficit researchers have depended on structural differences in language production and related them to cognition (Baratz, 1970:22). Labov makes a telling point when he stated that "one does not uncover the logical complexity of a body of speech by counting the number of subordinate clauses, ...unusual adjectives or conjunctions" (Labov:1972:305). He also suggests that there is a difference between "useful" and "stylistic" verbal styles by contrasting the speech of an older middle class male with that of a teenage black male tackling the same subject. Labov sees the middle class speaker's conversation as full of hedging and unclear, and the teenager's talk as brief and to the point (Labov, 1972:192-198). However, looking at the example another way, the boy does not consider many alternatives in his discussion. Labov could develop this point further.

Verbal Abilities: As early as 1962, Reismann questioned the widely held opinion that deprived children were non-verbal. He offers the

example of creative gang language and cites Havighurst who states that the disadvantaged use many words with accuracy, but they are not words used in school. Reissman also mentions some of Deutsch's early work in which he found deprived children able to give rich word associations in less structured situations (Reissman, 1962:74-80).

The black culture values verbal ability. The range of the black idiom includes skills in sounding, toasts, rifting, louding, rapping (Abrahams, 1970:27; Labov, 1972:192). Anyone who has done some record-and transcribing of tapes of these "non-verbal" children, probably feels that "the little chatterboxes are too verbal" (Dillard, 1972: 258). Labov points out that if the children were just culturally and linguistically deprived that the job of getting them to adopt standard English would be easier than it is. Persuading them to drop their own culture and language proves difficult (Labov, 1967:8).

Environment: Deficit theorists have offered opinions concerning the environment of the disadvantaged which are not documented by solid research (Wolfram, 1970:6). Statements about verbal interaction in urban black homes without much direct observation of those homes are questionable. Self report and interpretations as research have limitations (Labov, 1972:183). How satisfactory data could be obtained is still a question to me. Not many people are willing to be studied as the Lounds were for An American Family.

Dillard challenges the deficit environment image. He claims the children have language models different from the middle class ones, such as the storefront preacher or "Fancy Talkers." Children are out playing and interacting in the streets, not always watching television as some believe. He wonders about the connection between junkies and criminals and lack of verbal skill (Dillard, 1972:259). Origin and historical development of Black English are Dillard's forte. While I concur with the above remarks, they seem to border on the polemical with no more research basis than the "deficit" interpretations Labov complains about.

The Testing Situation:

"Face-to-face interaction has its own regulations, it has its own processes and its own structure, and these don't seem to be intrinsically linguistic in character, however often expressed through a linguistic medium. Social relationships are...major determinants of behavior."

(Goffman, 1972:66)

Goffman's statement about the significance of the social situation on language production suggests a new direction in research. According to many different theorists, the difficulty in obtaining accurate data has been the setting, not the disadvantaged child (Shuy, 1971b:14). Labov points out that classroom situation has been a source for much data favor-

ing the verbal deficit theory; he suggests that it is the classroom situation that inhibits language behavior (Whiteman and Deutsch, 1972: 50). To assess a child's linguistic ability, the teacher needs to be aware of the social situations which will draw out that particular child. McDavid provides another insight regarding "the situation" where subjects may adapt their behavior to experimenter expectations (McDavid, 1951:9). In addition, there is no guarantee that the experimental situation -- e.g., one in which the number of sentences used is a criteria for revealing communicative adequacy -- has any relationship to everyday speech situations (Wolfram, 1970:6).

Lack of success in obtaining language from disadvantaged children, even using a black interviewer, led Labov and his associates to scrutinize the interviewing situation. They obtained better results by setting up an informal situation: the interviewer sat on the floor so that he and the subject(s) were eye-to-eye; the interviewer introduced taboo words and conversation; the subject's best friend was present and potato chips were available (Labov, 1972:188). Only one case study was discussed in the article, so it remained for statistical studies to develop the provocative suggestions of Labov regarding the situation.

Donofrio explored how the social situation affected verbal output. Output was assessed by quantity, the number of words, and quality as defined by T-units, where the smallest units are considered sentences, and by uses of adjectives and adverbs. Interviewers, male Chicano and female Anglo asked middle and lower socio-economic children questions in dialect and in standard English. Both groups did better in quantity with the male Chicano interviewer asking questions in dialect. Children seemed to respond with better grammatical structure to questions in their own dialect. Baratz's research indicates that neither white nor black students are bi-dialectal; however, both respond with facility to their own dialect (Wolfram, 1970:3). Middle class children used more sentences responding to standard dialect questions, but used more words with Chicano questions. Lower-class children did poorly with the female Anglo interviewer whether she asked middle class or Chicano dialect questions, while middle class children did not do so well with the Anglo woman when she asked questions in Chicano dialect. Lower class children did not do better than middle class children in the Chicano dialect and Chicano interviewer situation, but the output means of the lower class children were much higher in this situation than any other and were close to middle class means (Donofrio, 1972:57-61). Problems with Donofrio's study that could be avoided in future studies were the small sample size ($n=20$); the definition of socio-economic status should be more refined; and controls for sex or a particular interviewer's style are needed.

Another area besides the situation that has been debated is in the type of items used in testing materials or questions in interview situations. Baratz points out that results on many tests indicate how much the disadvantaged child has internalized the mainstream society,

not his or her language capacity (Donofrio, 1972:25). Content of tests is questionable; for example, it is likely that urban children are interested in their own environment. Ducklings and moo cows may be further removed (Dillard, 1972:288-289). Ways in which questions are phrased can affect the subjects' responses. For example, lower class Mexican American children do not respond according to expectations to requests to "describe a picture." Rather than focusing on details of the picture, they talk about personality factors (Saratz, 1970:22). However, results on supposedly culture-free tests, e.g., Cattell Culture-Free Intelligence Test, Davis-Ellis Game, and Raven's Progressive Matrices, have shown that high socio-economic children do better than lower socio economic children (Donofrio, 1972:21).

Related to the questions asked are expectations for certain answers. Children who speak nonstandard dialect use forms which have surface structures at variance with the standard dialect's, yet correspond in meaning; for example, "He asked if I could go" (standard dialect); "He asked could I go" (non-standard dialect) as noted by Labov (1967:4). Performance on tests is equated mistakenly with ability (Shuy, 1971b:13).

The importance of these controversies can be shown in the use of data from language tests at one school. They cancelled a language experience program because the beginning tests indicated the students did not have sufficient language to embark on it (Whiteman and Deutsch, 1970:51).

Strategies

Previously classroom methods of handling the dialect problem have been poorly done for the following reasons:

1. Untrained teachers (Shuy, 1971b:22; Hess, 1972:9).
2. Specific problems have remained unknown until researched. Most materials focused on phonological rather than grammatical differences.
3. Specific methods were not in existence.
4. Publishers were unable to develop a sequence program because of the lack of research.
5. Approach emphasized nonstandard dialect as a deviation from the standard.
6. English teachers' interests lean toward literature rather than language (Shuy, 1971a:5).

Some materials developed occurred in haste without theoretical base because of a perceived need, and this has resulted in criticism when these

materials meet with less than success. Fasold and Wolfram had developed some dialect materials for high school reading. Philadelphia teachers who had used the readers stated that the kids were frustrated by them. If they could not read standard materials, they seemed to find the specially prepared materials equally difficult. Incidentally, I read Warren Miller's The Cool World, a junior novel in dialect. If disadvantaged children suffer the same "interference" I did, it must slow their progress.

Textbooks tend to glorify standard English. Only recently have we begun to see any materials presenting standard English as a series of regional dialects. The texts stress a corrective approach rather than allowing that language behavior varies with the situation. Frequently, textbooks and therefore class time is devoted to wasteful drills (Hess, 1972:9). Until Feigenbaum's English Now, no standard grammar texts mentioned black dialect, so teachers and students have remained unaware of any other language systems (Stewart, 1964:11). The tables in the appendices (tables C, D, and E) document the sorry state of grammar textbooks (Hess, 1972:78-80).

Robbins Burling argues that the problems nonstandard speakers face in school have less to do with dialect than with teacher attitude toward the nonstandard dialect (Burling, 1970:12). Many linguists and educators are coming to believe that there is a connection between teacher expectation and student self-concept. Guidelines for teacher behavior in relation to nonstandard speakers have been suggested.

Hess recommends that teachers recognize the high verbal abilities of minority children and encourage the children to use their dialect in the classroom (Hess, 1972:97). That the teacher build rapport through respect of the children's dialect is important; he or she can achieve this goal by avoiding the right vs. wrong approach and pointing out that appropriateness relates to the situation. The teacher should avoid being condescending, overly sympathetic and overbearing (Cromack, 1971:81; Johnson and Helen, 1971:79).

Most experts advise teachers to be aware of the dialect differences so they can differentiate between interference and real difficulties and so they can truly appreciate the dialect. Several advocate teachers learning the dialect themselves (Baratz, 1970:416; Goodman, 1971:103). In one of his workshops, Stewart drilled teachers in nonstandard dialect responses. Feigenbaum's program, English Now, requires a leader who may be a teacher or a student to use nonstandard dialect in the classroom. However, Reissman sees this question differently: "There is no need for the teacher to renounce her middle-class role and pretend to imitate the speech or style of the deprived child. He does not want the teacher to become deprived. He is not that pleased with his own situation in life" (Reissman, 1962:23-24). While I agree that patronizing behavior on the teacher's part is to be avoided at all costs, I see nothing wrong with an exchange of language. From my own experience in teaching, I have found that attempts to adopt the latest phrases or inflections in black

dialect or in teenage slang were appreciated by students. They were eager to share and be teachers, too. It is somewhat similar to being in a foreign country and trying to use the language there; the natives may laugh at mistakes made, but they feel pleasure and pride at your attempts.

Recommendations are made to upgrade training regarding nonstandard dialect.

"What universities need to provide for teachers in order to fulfill their educational obligations to the ghetto child is information on how to deal with the child's language, how to listen and respond to it, how to diagnose what is needed, how to best teach alternative linguistic systems and how to treat them as positive and healthy entities."

(Dillard, 1972:10)

These ideals are worthwhile, but little in terms of specific, concrete methods for teacher training have been developed. Shuy recommends that pre-service teachers be required to take the following coursework: The Nature of Language; Language Variation; Fieldwork in the Language of Children; Teaching Standard English; Reading, Oral Language and Composition. Through workshops we should try to reach in-service teachers. (Shuy, 1971b:22-24). Shuy's dream of required coursework in language is not likely to happen. Education students can barely complete their programs now as the liberal arts and education divisions battle for their time. The direction most schools are moving toward is free choice. By his own admission, Shuy is seeking jobs for employment-hungry linguists, and the outlook is dim. Requiring coursework is not my answer. Fieldwork, workshops, and supervision are my interests.

However, there are several experiences I would like to share with my student teachers. Shuy's Language Stereotype Index, which helps respondents in awareness of their own language attitudes and its correspondence with research on language seems to be a useful teaching aid. The Center for Applied Linguistics had audio-tapes as part of a Psycholinguistic Attitude Study. English Now, Feigenbaum's text, sounds promising. Also, some of the 1960's Trager-Smith films on dialects are still useful and fascinating. One technique I intend to use in both the Basic Composition and The Teaching of English courses is to have my students leaf through Warriner's Handbook type books and list the common errors mentioned. Then, professional writing samples will be evaluated according to the list of rules. This method has been used successfully in a Freshman English course (Funkhouser, 1973:808).

I would like to discuss some of these thoughts on language. Second dialect teaching involves dealing with alternative structures, not cognitive deficiencies. "Dat ain' no cup" is another way of saying "That is not a cup," therefore, the teacher does not instruct in the concept of negation but teaches the alternate form and the class discusses when to

use it (Dillard, 1972:270). Keep in mind that effective lessons deal with real problems. Help the child move from passive recognition to active production of standard English form when appropriate (Feigenbaum, 1970:91-02).

When to teach standard English to the nonstandard speaker is debatable. One group supports early teaching of the standard because that is the time when children learn language with the greatest facility (Deutsch, 1965:87). Others suggest postponing teaching standard English until ages 12-13 when awareness of societal pressures becomes more acute and when a change toward a more adult language in the black community naturally occurs (Johnson and Kenneth, 1971:100). Fasold and Shuy believe that people who find they need to learn standard English will learn it; they argue that desire provides motivation (Shuy, 1970:30-31). Burling suggests that standard English be an elective at the secondary level (Burling, 1970:15). Lack of research and adequate materials make it impossible to offer more than opinions on this issue. I hold with the elective approach and conference with students on specific problems in composition and speech if they express an interest.

The above concern relates especially to the teaching of reading. If use of "extant materials" are favored, the question of whether to teach standard English before or after initial reading instruction looms as important. Those who believe in teaching the standard dialect before reading instructions claim that dialect interference may be eliminated, or if the child's language system is cognitively deficient then he or she requires that instruction. Once the learner understands the correspondence between print and speech, then the transition to standard English readers will be easier (Dillard, 1972:284). However, it is important to remember that these children retained their dialect despite instruction. Unless some worthwhile use of the standard dialect occurs outside of the classroom for the children, teaching it may not be successful. Labov, Johnson and Feigenbaum prefer instruction in standard English to be postponed (Wolfram, 1970a:17-18).

A second approach to initial reading instruction for nonstandard speakers is dialect reading of traditional materials. The teacher's role in this situation is to center on the fundamentals of the reading process rather than spending time on interference problems. This approach presumes the teacher is aware of black dialect and how it differs from the standard, and that disadvantaged black children can understand standard English from the beginning. Because of standard structures with which the child may be unfamiliar, information may be lost and comprehension weak. There have been doubts expressed about the use of standard spellings with the phonics approach. However, Fasold found that traditional spelling was adequate for nonstandard dialect speakers (Wolfram, 1970a:18).

A third method involves revision of reading materials so grammatical forms unfamiliar to the nonstandard speaker would be eliminated. Differences in pronunciation would involve many words, so non-

standard dialect pronunciations would be accepted. On this page is a chart, created by Shuy, of standard constructions that might be eliminated in this approach.

Written Expression	Linguistic Feature	Oral Expression
1. John's house	possession	John house
2. John runs	3rd singular present	John run
3. ten cents	plurality	ten cent
4. He jumped	past tense	he jump
5. She is a cook	copula	She a cook
6. He doesn't have any toys	negation	He ain't got no toys He don't got no toys He don't have no toys
7. He asked if I came	past conditional question	He asked did I come
8. Every day when I come, he isn't here	negative context of be	Every day when I come he don't be here

(Cited in Wolfram, 1970a:19)

Rewording of possessive expressions (cf. item 1 in the chart) might appear in the following way in revised materials:

From: "John's new bike is blue. Mary's new bike is red. John's bike is bigger than Mary's."

To: "John has a new blue bike. Mary has a new bike too and it is red. The bike John has is bigger than the one Mary has."

However, were we to continue with Shuy's chart, has would not be usable. Practically all stories in the present tense would require drastic changes (Wolfram, 1970a:19-20). These limits are reminiscent of the artificial vocabulary limitations in the Dick and Jane type basal readers. The results in either case are stifled and boring. Wolfram suggests that major differences could be selected; e.g., just those involving lexical changes, not affixal forms.

The most radical proposal set forth involves the use of black dialect readers. Stewart, the strongest advocate, claims that the failure to recognize differences between black and standard dialects may have perpetuated the failure of the black students (Stewart, 1970a: 46). Dialect readers are considered a beginning step to be followed by the transition to standard English. The readers are in stages:

Stage I

"Charles and Michael, they out playing."

The first stage incorporates pure nonstandard dialect.

Stage II

"Charles and Michael, they are out playing."

At this stage the most significant features of standard dialect are presented.

Stage III

"Charles and Michael are out playing."

(Wolfram, 1970a:21)

Proponents of dialect readers assert that there is enough difference between standard and nonstandard dialects to require the non-standard dialect readers. While it is true that basal readers do not accurately reflect how middle-class readers speak, the divergence between nonstandard speakers and the texts is considered much greater. The readers may build self-concept which could have an affect on the on the child's success in reading. The black child faced with learning to read actually has two jobs: learning a new dialect and learning to read. Dialect readers cut the job down to size. Bilingual programs' success in utilizing the vernacular language is cited as a reason for trying the readers. The UNESCO report on language suggested that students should begin learning in their own dialect, then transfer to the national language (Wolfram, 1970a:22-23). A sample from a dialect reader follows:

Standard English Version

"Look down here," said Suzy.

"can see a girl in here.

That girl looks like me.

Come here and look, David.

Can you see that girl?"

Black English Version

"Susan say, 'hey you-all, look down here'.
 "I can see a girl in here.
 The girl, she look like me.
 Come here and look, David!
 Could you see the girl?"

(Wolfram, 1970a:21)

Naturally, there have been difficulties with dialect materials. Some are not accurate reproductions; e.g., *I Be Scared*, by Davis, Gladney, and Leaverton (1969) overuses the form "be" in types of constructions and in frequency (Wolfram, 1970a:22).

Voices have been raised in opposition. Burling states that since all students are required to learn new things, building materials like these may indicate to teachers that special techniques are necessary to cope with the problem (Burling, 1970:15). Bailey argues strenuously that: confusion may occur; since publishers are often not careful, poor materials may be the result; no standard of authentic dialect materials exists; black children have not learned basics essential for reading, e.g., word attach or phoneme-grapheme correspondences; dialect materials will hold children back from use of productive language and developing receptive competence; teachers who do not know dialect cannot be expected to use it (Bailey, 1970:8). Bailey has legitimate fears: however, much remains to be rescued. Wolfram questions whether dialect materials will, in fact, raise student self-concept (Wolfram, 1970a:22). Before the adoption of any educational innovation, community reaction should be considered. Labov found standard English to be highly valued in the black community. He stated that the dialect readers might be helpful, but without community support, their success would be dubious (Labov, 1967:5). Many black parents and community leaders see these materials as a way to keep blacks down, or as a condescending to help those who are incapable. Middle-class blacks are offended by the term, *Black Dialect*; "I don't speak that way, and I'm black" is often said (Wolfram, 1970a:22-23).

Kenneth Johnson feels that the opposition stems from ethnocentrism--seeing standard English as the best. The arguments against dialect readers, however, are complex. John's other remark, that we are assessing the effectiveness of an approach before allowing it to be tested, is valid (Johnson, 1971:55). Stewart concurs with the above statements. Can the results of an experimental group using black dialect materials be any worse than the failures we have now with the traditional reading program? (Stewart, 1970a:46).

Wolfram's conclusions are that teachers should accept dialect pronunciations of the traditional reading materials and that experiments to assess various revisions of dialect materials should be tried (Wolfram, 1970a:23). A variety of opinions exist as to the value and uses of drills. Research has shown that oral drills are more effective

than workbook drills (Loban, 1966:56). Feigenbaum points out that imitation and repetition drills are not useful. He suggests use of contrast and minimal pairs. Stewart concurs that contrastive study and systematic comparison are useful ways to teach standard English (Stewart, 1964:18). Exercise should incorporate the ways in which the nonstandard speaker's language system agrees or differs from the standard (Stewart, 1970b:14).

Feigenbaum's English Now utilizes the above suggestions to teach standard English; the text focuses on the similarities and differences between the two linguistic systems -- It employs a variety of drills:

Presentation Drill:

The learner hears two sentences and tells how they are different. For example, "He work hard" and "He works hard" are given. The learner is asked which one is standard.

Discrimination Drill:

The students are given pairs of sentences or words orally and are asked to state whether they are the same or different.

Teacher: He work hard.

Student: Different

He works hard.

Identification Drill:

The students identify one item without the aid of a second item.

Teacher: He drive a motorcycle. Student: Nonstandard

Translation Drill:

The students state an alternate form for a word.

Teacher: He works hard.

Student: He work hard.

Response Drill:

Beginning conversation - the teacher makes a statement to which the students give a suitable response.

Teacher: 1. Your friend work after school.

2. He gets good grades.

Student: 1. No, he don't/

Yes, he don't.

2. Yes, he does/

No, he doesn't.

(Feigenbaum, 1970:92-98)

As the student progresses, the drills allow him or her more freedom. The purposes are to differentiate standard and nonstandard forms and to produce responses appropriate to the situation. The drills are meant to be brief and fast-paced; ten minutes of a period might be spent doing an exercise. Feigenbaum advises teachers to use and look for natural expression. His criteria for appropriateness is that the expression be understood and that the variety of language does not interfere with the message. He claims that the use of nonstandard English may cause surprise initially, but no damaging effects on the student's use of language will occur (Feigenbaum, 1970:88 and 99-102).

Using these drills may have the result of according black English the respect that it deserves as a linguistic system. Students may be encouraged to use their own dialect in the classroom. Certainly this approach offers more than Nonstandard Dialect (1966) which has drills building standard English use only. It is important to remember that having all students work on the same skill is not an effective learning situation. Research, thus far, has shown that nonstandard speakers make only slight improvement in using the verb to be or in standardizing verb forms (Loban, 1966:56), so how successful Feigenbaum's English Now will be in helping students to use alternate language in different situations remains to be seen. Labov suggests that teachers stress the use of language as a means of handling social situations, e.g., for urban areas, emphasize averting or creating conflict, influencing other people, and street use (Labov, 1967:9).

Generally, though, the attitude toward teaching nonstandard speakers standard speech is laissez-faire. Is it necessary for everyone to speak with the same phonology and syntax? (Burling, 1970:13-15; Fasold, 1971:87). Teachers cannot do much about students' speech and should not tamper with it; however, writing, a different medium, presents different problems (Fasold, 1971:90).

J. Mitchell Morse, a faculty member in the English Department at Temple University, stated that Black English is "an unsatisfactory medium of communication of precise information or development of clear ideas." From his experience teaching freshman composition, he sees the problems black students have in composition as a limited variety of syntax and vocabulary. He believes that "a person who has difficulty with the agreement of subject and verb can't think clearly," and thus dovetails with the deficit theorists (Morse, 1973:838-841).

In contrast, Smitherman proposes that teachers ignore omissions of copula and s-morphemes from the third person singular, which are easy to mark, and concentrate on "content, message, logical development, use of supporting details and examples, analysis and arrangement, style, specificity, variation in word choice, sentence structure, and originality." She argues for moving toward "critical thinking, creativity, and analytical processes" and away from "grammatical overkill." Her position is based on her dissertation for which she investigated the writing and speaking skills of Detroit inner-city high school students and found that in their writing they tend to use the same adjectives repetitiously and to use simple sentence patterns (non-verb; noun-verb-noun). Smitherman (1973: 59-65; 1972:832) and Funkhouser (1973:809) both concur on this assessment.

Fasold delineates three types of errors in composition: 1) In organization and logical development, a difficulty which involves all writers; 2) In spelling and grammar (40% of these are attributed to interference from the nonstandard dialect); 3) In spelling, punctuation and grammar not due to dialect interference. In his opinion, errors caused by interference should not be considered errors at all (Fasold, 1971:88). Standard and nonstandard dialect: standard literary English and standard collo-

quial is the analogy Burling makes. If we can understand how a standard colloquial speaker learns standard literary style, we may gain insight into ways in which the nonstandard speaker learns. Standard speakers lose their final consonants and simplify final clusters (perhaps not as extensively as nonstandard speakers). Standard speakers say 'cause where they write because or they say in' while writing ing.

But deviations in pronunciation are not stigmatized as grammatical variations are. Standard colloquial speakers have to learn the be passive for writing instead of the conversational got passive. The system of negation for writing is different, too. For example, in writing, negative adverbs can be placed at the beginning of the sentence, inverting subject and verb; "Never have I seen," which would sound stilted if used in speech. Negation must be placed in the first available spot in the sentence or in the preverbal position. In written English we can express a negative in preverbal position by using a different indefinite, e. g., "I can't see nothing," the teacher can translate the literary form of "I can't see anything." Just as the standard colloquial speaker can say "I don't have any" translated into "I have none." Burling's point is that the standard colloquial speakers delete certain colloquial terms and take on some new expressions, and a similar process is going on for the nonstandard speaker. He extends this idea for reading, too (Burling, 1970:10-14). His case seems beautifully built until we examine some of his strategies. He suggests that reading is a way to learn new words. Has he forgotten that most urban blacks cannot read well? At certain points, his position seems to be that if the nonstandard forms were not stigmatized when the children were young, they would learn the standard forms. He suggests that high school teachers discuss errors in the got passive, etc., with the students; but they've been doing that for years. There is no reference or consideration given to the idea that perhaps written standard English could be further expanded to include more nonstandard expression, but perhaps this is an unrealistic point.

The positions that have developed regarding composition seem to range from correct everything to guide toward clarity and expressiveness. For teachers, though, clarity and expressiveness are elusive terms and difficult to evaluate. It seems that in all the areas of language arts, the teacher can offer the option of learning standard English to the child and provide him or her with reasons to learn; in the end, it remains an individual choice. Perhaps, if society grows and becomes more open in its acceptance of deviations from the norm and in social and economic mobility, the problems for the school in this area, at least, will diminish.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahams, Roger D. "The Advantages of Black English," The Florida FL Reporter (Spring/Fall 1970), pp. 27-30, 51.
- Bailey, Beryl Loftman. "Some Arguments Against the Use of Dialect Readers in the Teaching of Initial Reading," The Florida FL Reporter (Spring/Fall 1970), pp. 3, 47.
- Baratz, Joan C. "Should Black Children Learn White Dialect," Asha, 12 (September 1970), pp. 415-417.
- Bereiter, C., et al. (1966) "An Academically Oriented Pre-School for Culturally Deprived Children," Pre-School Education Today ed. by F. M. Hechinger. New York: Doubleday, pp. 105-137.
- Bernstein, Basil. "Elaborated and Restricted Codes: Their Social Origins and Some Consequences," American Anthropologist, 66 (December 1964), pp. 55-69.
- _____. "Social Class, Language, and Socialization," Language and Social Context ed. by Pier Paolo Giglioli. Baltimore, Maryland: Penquin Books, 1972 (1970), pp. 157-178.
- Brown, Bert R. "The Relationship of Language Development to Social Class and Intelligence," Institute for Developmental Studies Mimeograph, pp. 1-10.
- Burling, Robbins. "Standard Colloquial and Standard Written English: Some Implications for Teaching Literacy to Non-standard Speakers," The Florida FL Reporter (Spring/Fall 1970), pp. 9-15, 47.
- Cohn, Werner. "On the Language of Lower-Class Children," The School Review (1959), pp. 435-440.
- Cromack, Robert E. "The Functional Nature of Social Dialects: Social Change and the Teaching of Black English," The English Record ed. by Rodolfo Jacobson. XXI (April 1971), pp. 74-82.
- Deutsch, Martin. "The Role of Social Class in Language Development and Cognition," American Journal of Ortho-psychiatry, XXXV (January 1965), pp. 78-88.
- _____. The Disadvantaged Child. New York: Basic Books, 1967.
- _____. "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," Education in Depressed Areas ed. by A. H. Passow. New York: Columbia University, 1963, pp. 170-181.
- Dillard, J. L. "A New Problem for the Inner City Language Teacher" Mimeograph a: Center for Applied Linguistics.

- _____. Black English: Its History and Usage in the United States. New York: Random House, 1972.
- _____. "Lay My Isongloss Bundle Down," Mimeograph b.
- _____. "Negro Children's Dialect in the Inner City," The Florida FL Reporter (Fall 1967), pp. 7-8, 10.
- _____. "Nonstandard Negro Dialects -- Convergence or Divergence?" The Florida FL Reporter (Fall 1968).
- _____. "Principles in the History of American English -- Paradox, Virginity, and Cafeteria," The Florida FL Reporter (Spring/Fall 1970), pp. 32-33, 46.
- _____. "The Dare-ing Old Men on their Flying Isoglosses or, Dialectology and Dialect Geography," The Florida FL Reporter (Fall 1969), pp. 8-10, 22.
- Donofrio, Rosalie Maggio. "Situations and Language: A Sociolinguistic Investigation." ED 068-236.
- Ellis, Dean S. "Speech and Social Status in America," Social Forces, 45 (March 1967), pp. 431-437.
- Englemann, Siegfried. "The Inadequacies of the Linguistic Approach in Teaching Situations," Sociolinguistics; A Crossdisciplinary Perspective. Center for Applied Linguistics, 1971, pp. 141-151.
- Fasold, Ralph W. "What Can an English Teacher Do About Nonstandard Dialect," The English Record ed. by Rodolfo Jacobson. XXI (April 1971), pp. 82-91.
- Feigenbaum, Irwin. "The Use of Nonstandard English in Teaching Standard: Contrast and Comparison," Teaching Standard English in the Inner City ed. by Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy. Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970, pp. 87-104.
- Fishman, Joshua A. "Sociolinguistics," The Florida FL Reporter (Spring/Fall 1970), pp. 40-42, 52.
- Funkhouser, James L. "A Various Standard," College English, 34 (March 1973), pp. 806-827.
- Furfey, Paul Hanly. "The Sociological Implications of Substandard English," The American Catholic Sociological Review, 1 (March 1944), pp. 3-9.
- Goffman, E. "The Neglected Situation," Language and Social Context ed. by Pier Paolo Giglioli. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1972 (1964), pp. 61-66.

- Goodman, Kenneth. "Who Gave Us the Right?," The English Record, XXI (April 1971), pp. 91-95.
- Hess, Karen M. "Targeted Communications: Teaching a Standard English to Speakers of Other Dialects." ED 065 892.
- Huffine, Carol L. "Inter-Socio-Economic Class Language Differences," Sociology and Social Research, 50 (April 1966), pp. 351-355.
- Hopper, Robert, et. al. "Speech Characteristics and Employability." ED 067 713.
- Harms, Leroy Stanley. Social Judgments of Status Cues in Language. Unpublished dissertation. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc. 1959.
- Hoffman, Melvin J. "Bi-dialectualism is not the Linguistics of White Supremacy: Sense Versus Sinsibilities," The English Record, XXI (April 1971), pp. 95-101.
- Imhoff, Maurice L. (ed.) "The Preparation of Language Arts Teachers for Ghetto Schools," Viewpoints. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1971, pp. 125-135.
- Jensen, Arthur. "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement," Harvard Educational Review, 39 (Winter 1969)
- Johnson, Helen W. "Teacher Attitude and Ghetto Language," Viewpoints ed. by Maurice L. Imhoff, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1971, pp. 73-81.
- Johnson, Kenneth R. "Should Black Children Learn Standard English," Viewpoints ed. by Maurice L. Imhoff. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1971, pp. 83-101.
- _____. "The Influence of Nonstandard Negro Dialect on Reading Achievement," The English Record, XXI (April 1971), pp. 148-155.
- Kochman, Thomas. "Reading, Culture and Personality," The Florida FL Reporter (Spring/Fall 1970), pp. 24-24, 49.
- Labov, William. "Some Sources of Reading Problems for Negro Speakers of Non-Standard English," NCTE Spring Institute on New Directions in Elementary English (March 5, 1966), Mimeograph, pp. 1-38.
- _____. "The Logic of Nonstandard English." Language and Social Context ed. by Pier Pablo Giglioli. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1972 (1969).
- _____. "The Non-Standard Vernacular of the Negro Community," Temple--AACTE--NDEA Title XI English Education Seminar, May 17-18, 1967.

- _____. "The Study of Language in its Social Context," Language and Social Context ed. by Pier Paolo Giglioli. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1972 (1970), pp. 283-305.
- Lawton, Denis. "Social Class Language Differences in Group Discussions," Language and Speech, 7 (July-September 1964), pp. 182-204.
- Lee, Richard R. "The Social Evaluation of Speech: Implications from the Laboratory to the Classroom." ED 066 933.
- Loban, Walter. Problems in Oral English. Champaign, Illinois. NCTE, 1966.
- Malmstrom, Jean. "Love Me or Leave Me But Don't Waste the Time.": Dialects in Today's Schools, The English Record, XXI (April 1971), pp. 102-108.
- _____. "Teaching Linguistically in Elementary School," The Florida FL Reporter (Spring/Fall 1970), pp. 31, 48.
- McDavid, Raven I. "American Social Dialects," College English (January 1965a), NCTE reprint, pp. 10-16.
- _____. (ed.) An Examination of the Attitudes of the NCTE Toward Language. Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1965b.
- _____. "The Cultural Matrix of American English," Elementary English (January 1965c), NCTE reprint, pp. 1-10.
- McDavid, Raven I. and Virginia Glenn. "The Relationship of the Speech of American Negroes to the Speech of Whites," American Speech XXVI (February 1951), pp. 1-17 (Bobbs-Merrill Reprint Series).
- Morse, J. Mitchell "The Shuffling Speech of Slavery: Black English," College English, 34 (March 1973), pp. 834-843.
- O'Neill, Wayne. "The Politics of Bidialectalism." College English, 33 (January 1972), 433-438.
- Penderson, Lee A. "Nonstandard Negro Speech in Chicago," Nonstandard Speech and the Teaching of English, Center of Applied Linguistics, 1964, pp. 18-23.
- Politzer, Robert L. "Auditory Discrimination and the 'Disadvantaged': Deficit or Difference," The English Record XXI (April 1971), pp. 174-179.
- Reissman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York, 1962.
- Richards, Jack C. "Social Factors, Interlanguage and Language Learning." ED 066 966.

Shuy, Roger W. "Social Dialects and Second Language Learning: A Case of Territorial Overlap," TESOL Newsletter (September/December 1971a), pp. 5, 19-21.

_____. "Sociolinguistic Strategies for Studying Urban Speech," Viewpoints, ed. by Maurice L. Imhoff. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1971b, pp. 1-25.

_____. "Some Problems in Studying Negro/White Speech Differences," The English Record, XXI (April 1971c), pp. 179-185.

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Vintage Books, 1970.

Sledd, James. "Bidialectalism: The Linguistics of White Supremacy," English Journal 58 (December 1969), 1307-1315.

_____. "Doublespeak: Dialectology in the Service of Big Brother," College English, 33 (January 1972), 439-456.

Smitherman, Geneva. "English teacher, why you be doing the things you don't do?" English Journal 61 (January 1972), pp. 59-65.

_____. "God Don't Never Change: Black English from a Black Perspective," College English, 34 (March 1973), pp. 828-833.

Spears, M. K. "You Makin' Sense," The New York Review of Books (November 16, 1972), pp. 32-35.

Stewart, William. "Continuity and Change in American Negro Dialects," The Florida FL Reporter (Spring 1968), Mimeograph, pp. 1-20.

_____. "Current Issues in the Use of Negro Dialect in Beginning Reading Texts," The Florida FL Reporter (Spring/Fall 1970a), pp. 3-7, 46.

_____. "Facts and Issues Concerning Black Dialect," The English Record, XXI (April 1971), pp. 121-135.

_____. "Foreign Language Teaching Methods in Quasi-Foreign Language Situations," Teaching SE in the Inner City ed. by Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy. Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970b, pp. 1-19.

_____. "Observations on the Problems of Defining Negro Dialect," Center for Applied Linguistics. Mimeograph, pp. 1-7.

_____. "Sociolinguistic Factors in the History of American Negro Dialects," The Florida FL Reporter (Spring 1967), pp. 1-4.

_____. "Urban Negro Speech: Sociolinguistic Factors Affecting English Teaching," Social Dialects and Language Learning ed. by

W. Shuy. Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1964, pp. 10-18.

Whiteman, Martin and Martin Deutsch. "Reaction to William Labov's 'The Logic of Nonstandard English'," The Florida FL Reporter (Spring/Fall 1970), pp. 43, 50.

Williams, Frederick and Jack L. Whitehead. "Language in the Classroom: Studies of the Pygmalion Effect," The English Record, XXI (April 1971) pp. 108-113.

Wolfram, Walt. "Black-White Speech Differences Revisited," Viewpoints ed. by Maurice L. Imhoff. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1971, pp. 27-50.

_____. "Sociolinguistic Alternatives in Teaching Reading to Nonstandard Speakers," The Florida FL Reporter (Spring/Fall 1970a), pp. 16-23, 48, 52.

_____. "Sociolinguistic Implications for Educational Sequencing," Teaching SE in the Inner City ed. by Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy. Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970b.

_____. "The Nature of Nonstandard Dialect Divergence," Research Bases for Oral Language Instruction ed. by Thomas D. Horn, Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1970.

APPENDIX A: Positions Chart*

Should We Teach Urban Black Students Standard English?

PRO	CON
1. Economic handicap	1. Racism, not language, is the issue. Even if black people adopt standard English, getting a job or being accepted by white society will not be any easier.
2. Social handicap: people assess others by their speech.	2. cf. supra, number 1.
3. Educational handicap: these students cannot read, write or speak standard English with any facility, and societal and school materials are in standard English.	3. Mainstream society needs to be educated out of its prejudices.
4. Standardization is a socio-cultural way of life.	4. How much do we value conformity? Nonstandard speakers tend to lose facility in dialect as they progress in standard English.
5. Students' language problems are indicative of a cognitive deficit or of genetic inferiority.	5. Educators are not responding to these children in their code. Damage to self-esteem may be considerable.
6. Black English is a sloppy distortion of standard English.	6. Black English is a systematic language worthy of respect and study.

* It is possible to agree with several statements on the "con" side and still support the teaching of standard English.

APPENDIX B

Scales used to index the two-factor model
in study one:

- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: limited _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ versatile*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *confident _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unsure
- THE SPEAKER: has problems communicating _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ communicates well*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: cold _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ warm
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: disadvantaged _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ advantaged*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: hard to understand _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ easy to understand*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: hesitant _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ fluent*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *Anglo-like _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ non Anglo-like
- THE SPEAKER'S BACKGROUND IS: different from mine _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ like mine*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: lazy _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ energetic*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *tall _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ short
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *eager _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ reticent
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *interested _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ uninterested
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *calm _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ frightened
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *cooperative _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ uncooperative
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *casual _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ formal
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *dependable _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ undependable
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *educated _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ uneducated
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *fast _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ slow
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *enthusiastic _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ lacking in enthusiasm
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: repetitive _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ concise
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: old _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ young
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: disorganized _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ organized
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: evasive _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ straightforward*
- THE SPEAKER: uses many words _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ uses few words*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *thorough _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ superficial
- THE SPEAKER HAS A: bad voice _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ good voice*
- THE SPEAKER'S TONE IS: even _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ varied*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *cheerful _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ sad
- THE SPEAKER: *expresses himself well _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ poorly
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *relaxed _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ tense
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: impractical _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ practical*
- THE SPEAKER IS A: poor learner _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ good learner*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: incoherent _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ coherent*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: *decisive _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ indecisive
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: unintelligent _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ intelligent*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: unfriendly _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ friendly*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: timid _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ self-assured*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: disagreeable _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ agreeable*
- THE SPEAKER SOUNDS: unsure of himself _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ sure of himself*

*The asterisks define the pole of the scale assigned a value of 1.0 in the qualification scheme, the asterisks did not appear on the actual instrument.

APPENDIX C

TABLE 1
TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS
OF TYPES OF USAGE FEATURES

Category I (Strongest Negative Reaction)	No. of Textbooks Covering Feature
1. + aux (She <u>been</u> hit the ball over the fence.)	4
2. aux $\rightarrow$ aux (He <u>done</u> been in the hospital for two weeks.)	21
3. + ed (She <u>putted</u> the candle too close to the tree.)	11
4. + gots (He gots a '68 Charger.)	0
5. $\emptyset$ ing (He was <u>try</u> to stop the fire.)	6
6. v $\rightarrow$ v (I <u>seen</u> a good movie./Bill <u>come</u> down the hill.)	80
7. + comp (Jim is the <u>most</u> <u>smartest</u> boy.)	41
8. be $\rightarrow$ v (He <u>be</u> hoping to get a scholarship to go to college.)	0
9. pn $\rightarrow$ pn (<u>Him</u> and <u>her</u> went to the store.)	68
10. + N (I <u>don't</u> have no shoes.)	35
11. + s pl (There were ten childrens in our family.)	8
12. t/O (I <u>tink</u> the voting age is eighteen.)	2
13. + s verb (They all <u>rides</u> to school on the bus.)	7
14. it/there (It wasn't anybody on the street last night.)	5

APPENDIX D

Table 1 - Continued

Category II (Mildly negative reaction)		No. of Textbooks Covering Feature
15.	Ø a verb (He <u>ride</u> to school with me every morning.)	3
16.	+ here (This <u>here</u> microphone seems to be stuck.)	2
17.	d/o (My parents are watching <u>dis</u> program.)	3
18.	irreg. verb: don't (It <u>don't</u> matter what I do.)	8
19.	+ pn (My brother <u>he</u> lets me use his car.)	6
20.	Ø be (She _____ a good teacher.)	1
21.	Ø prep (My mother flew _____ Washington to accept a medal.)	2
22.	ain't (There <u>ain't</u> anything Jim doesn't know.)	6
23.	Ø final d (Ø final con.) (We're getting new <u>re'</u> and blue jerseys.)	2
24.	Ø poss (I went to a girl__school before coming here.)	36
25.	Ø art (We all go to _____ circus every year.)	2
26.	Ø -ed (Last night I work__ four hours.)	7
27.	a _____ an (He brought <u>a</u> apple for the teacher.)	13
28.	Ø p1 (He made fifty cent__ an hour.)	20
29.	+ prep (at) (I asked the librarian where it was <u>at</u> .)	1

APPENDIX E

Table 2 presents the types of exercises that were found in the textbooks. It is important to note that over two-thirds of the exercise materials were blank-fill exercises or blank-fill with a slight modification. It should also be noted that approximately three-fourths of the exercise material was classified as either blank-fill or pattern practice.

TABLE 2
Type of Exercise

	N	%
Blank Fill	16,506	68.25
Pattern Practice	3,790 + 33 exercises with adaptive patterns	16.00
Rewrite	1,439	6.00
Creating Sentences	116	.50
Games	65	.25
Literature Study Form Discriminatory	None	None
Other such as Role Playing, Dramatization, Interpretation, Puzzles, and Drawing	2,060	9.00
TOTAL	24,342	